

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on April 4, 2008 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed April 4, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The Applicant argues that the combination of Anderson in view of Stam et al. fails to disclose displaying a high-resolution image corresponding to a prior low-resolution image without displaying the prior low-resolution. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Anderson discloses that when the navigation button is no longer depressed or held down while searching for an image then the low-resolution (scrennail image) that is currently on the display is replaced with the corresponding high-resolution image. Stam et al. discloses overshoot correction when searching for an image by determining the frame where the user stopped fast-forwarding and to start displaying from a point prior to that frame. Therefore, if Anderson were to correct for the user's overshoot the low-resolution image

(screennail image) that is currently on the display is replaced with a high-resolution image that would correspond to a prior low-resolution image.

Furthermore, Anderson states that a high-resolution image may replace the low-resolution image on display either by displaying the high resolution image line by line or in its entirety all at once, meaning that the low-resolution image is not needed for the decompression of the high-resolution image and that the high-resolution is a stand alone image. Therefore, the combination of Anderson in view of Stam et al. meets the claimed limitations and the rejection is maintained.

Regarding the PTO-1449 form that was filed on October 25, 2005 and not signed by the Examiner, it was communicated to the Applicant on May 20, 2008 that this form has been filed and all other PTO-1449 forms have been signed.

Therefore, when combining the Stam reference with the Anderson reference it teaches the Anderson reference to compensate for the user's overshoot and instead of displaying the high resolution image of the low-resolution image that the user stopped fast-forwarding on it displays a high resolution image of an image prior to that low-resolution image.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson (U.S. Patent 5,933,137) in view of Stam et al. (U.S. Patent 6,850,691).

Regarding claim 1, Anderson discloses an image reproduction apparatus comprising: an interface unit connected to a detachable memory configured to store a plurality of image files, each image file having a file structure that includes at least a high-resolution and a low-resolution image, for each image (Fig. 6); a display unit (402) configured to display an image file of the plurality of image files stored in the detachable memory that is connected via the interface unit; an operating unit operated by a user for forwarding an image displayed on the display unit (Fig. 5A); and a control unit configured to cause the display unit to successively display a low-resolution image of the plurality of image files at fast speed while the operating unit is in a predetermined operating state, and to display a high-resolution image on the display unit when the operating unit is released from the predetermined operating state (Fig. 11A; col. 13, lines 36-45). However Anderson fails to disclose displaying a high resolution image corresponding to a prior low-resolution image that is a predetermined number of images prior to the latest low-resolution image displayed on the display unit when the operating unit is released from the predetermined operating state, without displaying the prior low-resolution image or a high-resolution image corresponding to the latest low-resolution image.

Referring to the Stam et al. reference, Stam et al. discloses an image reproduction apparatus wherein a control causes the display unit to successively display image files at a fast speed while the operating unit is in a predetermined operating state, and to display a second image that is a predetermined number of images prior to the first image displayed on the display unit when the operating unit is released from the predetermined operating state, without displaying the prior images (col. 2, lines 2-9 and 25-34).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have corrected an overshoot when stopping the fast forwarding function as disclosed by Stam et al. with the apparatus disclosed by Anderson in order to accommodate for the user's reaction time, the time it takes for the user's command to be sent to the device along with the time it takes for the device to react, and to accommodate for the speed of the fast forward or reverse mode.

Regarding claim **2**, Anderson in view of Stam et al. discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 including that the predetermined operating state is a state maintained continuously by the operating unit at a predetermined operating position for a predetermined time period (Anderson: Fig. 11A – the searching continues while the navigation button is held down).

Regarding claim **3**, Anderson in view of Stam et al. discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 as well as disclosing

an image reproduction apparatus further comprising a setting unit configured to set the predetermined number of images depending on the fast forward speed (Stam et al.: col. 2, lines 25-34).

Regarding claim **4**, Anderson in view of Stam et al. discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 including that the predetermined number of images is set according to how the user operates the operating unit with respect to the fast forwarding display (Stam et al.: col. 2, lines 17-24 – the device adapts to the user by remembering how much the user corrects after they stop the fast forwarding mode).

Regarding claim **5**, Anderson in view of Stam et al. discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 as well as disclosing an image reproduction apparatus further comprising a setting unit configured to set the predetermined number of images depending on a user-specified number (Stam et al: col. 2, lines 35-46 – this device allows two ways for the user to set the predetermined number, one way is to take a test to figure out the user's reaction time and the other way to allow the user to simply set a sensitivity setting).

Regarding claim **6**, Anderson in view of Stam et al. discloses all the limitations as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 including that the first image is fast forward displayed when the operating unit is not in the predetermined operating state (Anderson: Fig. 11A – the high resolution image is displayed when the navigation button is not being held down).

Regarding claim **7**, this is a method claim corresponding to the apparatus claim 1. Therefore, claim 7 is analyzed and rejected as previously discussed with respect to claim 1.

Regarding claim **8**, this is a computer program claim corresponding to the apparatus claim 1. Therefore, claim 8 is analyzed and rejected as previously discussed with respect to claim 1.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to HEATHER R. JONES whose telephone number is (571)272-7368. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. - Thurs.: 7:00 am - 4:30 pm, and every other Fri.: 7:00 am - 3:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Miller can be reached on 571-272-7353. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

Application/Control Number: 10/774,254

Page 8

Art Unit: 2623

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/John W. Miller/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2623

Heather R Jones
Examiner
Art Unit 2621

HRJ
May 20, 2008